

JAN 89

Nirvana

Car A, 1985: 17 USAF, Marshall, behind war over
of Sept, Oct. would be

LeMay: in 2 weeks

2) or SU

3) or allowing Emperor

But the assumed war bombing?

More Japanese dead?

(If you wanted

To avoid latter: 2 and/or 3:

LeMay: in

"Justification for Tokyo bombing — "To avoid
1M dead."

But that had been overlooked by Tokyo —
and by next 4 months of bombing (+ blockade)
to point where either

1) offering Emperor was sufficient (+ necessary)
to surrender

(necessary)
or 2) offering Emperor + SU city was sufficient.

(Even Bomb + SU city were not sufficient
to get surrender without offering Emperor: though
either might have been; and Bomb was tried; SU
city could have been tried

Shows how little
justification was
needed for
LeMay's Act.

Meanwhile, 1000 planes over Hiroshima, 6 KT, on Aug 14 after Tokyo
1014 had broadcast caption of US time.

For 1985:

46 - 47. K/T Thesis: Hiroshima was in the "domain of loss": If Byrnes couldn't get rollback from SU [also couldn't see the bomb as ^{use of} continuity & this - except Stimson; was he implicated - Yalta too, or not? (not ⁴⁵ ~~Davis~~, or ⁴⁷ ~~Szilard~~)

his credibility was shot - he had over-drawn on ~~this~~ cred. account, claimed no concessions had been made. (i.e. he concealed his obligations/debt, or overstated his assets: secretly bankrupt, unless he could make good by threats/extension, or by gambling
(or - Stimson? - by staring/selling atom secrets?)

34 What is revealed of GA's analysis is hist/JB/Stimson preference, ~~to choose~~ for use of weapons rather than ending war by SU warning or entry or US promise or Embargo (or, war bonding & blockade)
(or lending: us. invasion).

- (What if bonding was seen as only averting lending (ignoring other ways of doing this), not invasion?

i.e. saving 30,000 US lives (not 500,000 - 1/4)?

- What if Tokyo, etc. is evaluated in this light?

- A-bomb differed from Tokyo